arXiv:hep-th/9706129v2 23 Jun 1997

Heat-kernel coefficients for oblique boundary conditions

J.S.Dowker*, Klaus Kirsten†

*Department of Theoretical Physics,
The University of Manchester, Manchester, England

†Universität Leipzig, Institut für Theoretische Physik,
Augustusplatz 10, 04109 Leipzig, Germany

Abstract

We calculate the heat-kernel coefficients, up to a_2, for a U(1) bundle on the 4-Ball for boundary conditions which are such that the normal derivative of the field at the boundary is related to a first-order operator in boundary derivatives acting on the field. The results are used to place restrictions on the general forms of the coefficients. In the specific case considered, there can be a breakdown of ellipticity.

---

*dowker@a3.ph.man.ac.uk

†Klaus.Kirsten@itp.uni-leipzig.de

The coefficients in the small-time asymptotic expansion of the heat-kernel for a second order operator Δ play important roles both in quantum field theory and pure mathematics. For bounded manifolds, the simplest boundary conditions are those that make the operator self-adjoint, this usually being the case when physics dictates the conditions. Δ is typically the Laplacian, Δ_2, on a Riemannian manifold, $\mathcal{M}$.

The traditional conditions are Dirichlet and Neumann, and also a generalisation of the latter, sometimes referred to as Robin conditions, but which go back at least to Newton. Recently, in response to questions arising in quantum gravity, gauge theory and string theory, [1–4], a generalised form of Robin conditions that involves *tangential*, as well as normal derivatives has been found necessary. In the mathematical literature these conditions are sometimes referred to as *oblique*. More generally, the boundary condition becomes nonlocal on the boundary. The operator Δ can remain self-adjoint.

Some of the lower heat-kernel coefficients (up to a_1) have been evaluated by McAvity and Osborn [2] using their extension of the recursion method developed by De Witt, following Hadamard, for closed Riemannian manifolds. Another approach has been expounded by Avramidi and Esposito [3] based on the functorial methods most systematically used by Branson and Gilkey [5]. They also computed the coefficients in the very special case of a flat ambient manifold with a totally geodesic, flat boundary.

Although these boundary conditions have been the subject of classical analysis (see *e.g.* [6–9]), the explicit determination of the heat-kernel coefficients is in its infancy and in this letter we wish to report on this question using the approach of special case evaluation as particularly described in [10] on the ball. (See also [11]). We are able to obtain more information on some higher coefficients that, in conjunction with the functorial technique, will aid in determining their general forms, should these be required.

The evaluation is somewhat more involved than that for the standard conditions which are local on the boundary so we shall simply outline the method, giving the results and some commentary just to show what can be achieved. It will not be possible to work in arbitrary dimensions, which was a feature of [11], rather we will be restricted to dimension four.Nevertheless, sufficient interesting information will emerge to justify exposure now.

A hidden element of the calculation is the free use of algebraic manipulation. Because of the complexity of the expressions, this is almost necessary but should be viewed simply as convenient bookkeeping.

McAvity and Osborn [2] have employed a generalised form of Robin conditions, written in the way adopted by Avramidi and Esposito [3]

$$\mathcal{B} = \nabla_N + \frac{i}{2}\big(\Gamma^i\widehat{\nabla}_i + \widehat{\nabla}_i\Gamma^i\big) - S, \tag{1}$$

which involves tangential (covariant) derivatives, $\widehat{\nabla}_i$, computed from the induced metric on the boundary. Γ^i is a bundle endomorphism valued boundary vector field satisfying $\Gamma^\dagger = \Gamma$ (our Γ_i differs from that in [3] by a factor of i) and S is a hermitian bundle automorphism. ∇_N is, for us, the *outward* normal derivative at the boundary.

The condition on a section of some vector bundle V is

$$\mathcal{B}V\big|_{\partial\mathcal{M}} = 0. \tag{2}$$

The first two nontrivial heat-kernel coefficients for the differential operator $-\Delta_2 + E$ are written in the form used by Avramidi and Esposito,

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{1/2}(f) =& \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2}\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} f\,\mathrm{Tr}\,(\gamma),\\
a_1(f) =& \frac{1}{6}\int_{\mathcal{M}} f\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\big(\alpha_1 E + \alpha_2 R\big)\\
&+ \frac{1}{6}\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} \mathrm{Tr}\,\big(f(b_0\kappa + b_2 S) + b_1 f_N\big)\\
&\quad + \frac{1}{6}\int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} f\,\mathrm{Tr}\,\big(\sigma_1\kappa_{ij}\Gamma^i\Gamma^j\big),
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where f is a test ('smearing') function, f_N being its normal derivative. The 'numerical' coefficients computed by McAvity and Osborn are

$$\begin{aligned}
\gamma &= \frac{2}{(1-\Gamma^2)^{1/2}} - 1\\
b_0 &= 2 - 6\bigg(\frac{1}{2\Gamma}\log\frac{1+\Gamma}{1-\Gamma} - \frac{1}{1-\Gamma^2}\bigg)\\
b_1 &= 3\bigg(1 - \frac{1}{\Gamma}\log\frac{1+\Gamma}{1-\Gamma}\bigg)\\
b_2 &= \frac{12}{1-\Gamma^2}\\
\sigma_1\Gamma^2 &= b_0 - 2,
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where $\Gamma^2 = \Gamma^i\Gamma_i$. The α_1 and α_2 in (3) are the standard numbers for the volume part.

Unfortunately in this letter we will be able to show only the unsmeared results (*i.e.* $f = 1$), although it is possible to extend the method of [11] to cover the general situation (Dowker and Kirsten, in preparation).

As the simplest case, we take V to be a $U(1)$ bundle (a complex scalar) and the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ to be the 4-ball so that $\partial\mathcal{M}$ is the 3-sphere. Γ^i is then just a real vector field on S^3. Nonsingular vector fields exist on all odd spheres of course.

The condition (1) can be rearranged

$$\mathcal{B} = \nabla_N - \big(S - \frac{i}{2}(\widehat{\nabla}_i\Gamma^i)\big) + i\Gamma^i\widehat{\nabla}_i \tag{5}$$

Since V is a scalar its covariant derivative is the ordinary one.

In order to apply the condition (5) we must fix on a simple Γ^i. It is always advantageous to go to a local frame – say a right invariant one – and introduce anholonomic coordinates through a set of dreibeine,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_i &= A_i^a\, X_a \\ \Gamma^i &= A_a^i\, \Gamma^a, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where the $-iX_a$ are *right* angular momentum generators. We thus replace (5) by

$$\mathcal{B} = \partial_r - S' + i\Gamma^a X_a, \tag{7}$$

where S' is the bracketed term in (5).

The condition (2) must now be implemented on the modes which here take the form of a *sum* of boundary modes,

$$\Phi(k) = \sum_\alpha C^\alpha(k)\frac{J_{\nu(\alpha)}(kr)}{r^{(d-1)/2}}\,Y_\alpha(\Omega) \tag{8}$$

where the harmonics on the d-dimensional boundary satisfy

$$\Delta_{\partial\mathcal{M}}Y(\Omega) = -\lambda^2 Y(\Omega)$$

and

$$\nu^2 = \lambda^2 + (d-1)^2/4. \tag{9}$$

In the present special case $d = 3$ and the surface harmonics are, conveniently, representation matrices of $SU(2)$,

$$Y_\alpha(\Omega) = \mathcal{U}^{(L)}_{mn}(\Omega); \quad \alpha = (L, m, n),$$

where $\mathcal{U}$ stands for the normalised eigenfunctions and $\lambda^2 = 4L(L+1)$ with $L = 0, 1/2, 1, \ldots$ so that from (9), $\nu = 2L + 1$.

The eigenmodes (8) are finite at the origin and have nonzero eigenvalues $-k^2$. There should be another label on Φ and $C^\alpha(k)$ to take over the role of α which would come from solving some secular determinant. We shall not need it.

In detail, (2) is

$$\sum_{L'm'n'} C^{(L'm'n')} \bigg(\mathcal{U}^{(L')}_{m'n'} \big(\partial_r - S'\big) \frac{J_{\nu(L')}(kr)}{r} \bigg|_{r=1} + J_{\nu(L')}(k) i \Gamma^a X_a \mathcal{U}^{(L')}_{m'n'} \bigg) = 0. \quad (10)$$

Now we use the right action

$$X_a \mathcal{U}^{(L)} = 2i \mathcal{U}^{(L)} J_a, \quad (11)$$

expressed in matrix form, where the J_a are the standard spin-L angular momentum matrices (the 2 is a normalisation factor) and simplify by taking the Γ^a to be constants. By a property of the right-invariant dreibeine, Γ^i then has vanishing covariant divergence. This means $S = S'$ and also that the integrated flux across the boundary, $\frac{i}{2} \int_{\partial\mathcal{M}} \big(V^* \nabla_N V - V \nabla_N V^* \big)$, vanishes.

Multiplying (10) by $\mathcal{U}^{(L)*}_{mn}$ and integrating over S^3 we get, using orthogonality,

$$C^{(Lmn)} \big(\partial_r - S\big) \frac{J_{\nu(L)}(kr)}{r} \bigg|_{r=1} - 2 J_{\nu(L)}(k) \sum_{n'} C^{(Lmn')} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}.\mathbf{J}_{nn'}(L) = 0. \quad (12)$$

As expected, we can drop the left m labelling. Furthermore, if we make the special, diagonal choice,

$$\boldsymbol{\Gamma}.\mathbf{J} = \Gamma^0 J_z, \quad (13)$$

the sum in (12) reduces to one term ($n' = n$) and the C's cancel to give

$$\big(\partial_r - S\big) \frac{J_{\nu(L)}(kr)}{r} \bigg|_{r=1} - 2 J_{\nu(L)}(k)\, \Gamma^0\, n = 0. \quad (14)$$

We see that the eigenvalues, k^2, depend on n through this *generalised Robin condition* but we have obtained a condition to which our earlier methods can be applied, with some modifications which will now be outlined.

The general technique has been described in sufficient detail in [10] so that only the novelties arising in the present calculation need be indicated.

The idea is to compute the coefficients from the analytical properties of the relevant ζ–function which can be found by progressive continuation of an expression that incorporates the eigenvalue condition (14) through a contour integral.

The method involves taking the logarithm of (14) and employing the asymptotic behaviour of the Bessel functions in order to perform the continuation systematically, thereby gradually revealing the ζ–function's pole structure. The heat-kernel coefficients are related to the residues by a standard formula.

The condition (14) is slightly rewritten as

$$kJ'_\nu(k) + (u+2gn)J_\nu(k) = 0, \tag{15}$$

where we have set $u = -S-1$ and $\Gamma_0 = -g$ for notational reasons. Also $\nu = 2L+1$ and, for each L, n runs from $-L$ to L. It is the appearance of the n in the last term that causes the added complications.

Shifting the contour to the imaginary axis, the ζ–function reads

$$\zeta(s) = \frac{\sin \pi s}{\pi} \sum_{Lmn} \int_0^\infty dz\ (z\nu)^{-2s} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \log z^{-\nu} \Big[z\nu I'_\nu(z\nu) + (u+2gn) I_\nu(z\nu) \Big]. \tag{16}$$

As shown in detail in [11] the heat-kernel coefficients are determined solely by the asymptotic contributions of the Bessel functions as $\nu \to \infty$, but now more care is needed since terms like n/ν have to be counted as of order ν^0.

Applying this technique, one encounters the expression

$$\begin{aligned} \log \left\{ 1 + \left(1 + \frac{2gn}{\nu} t\right)^{-1} \left[\sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{v_k(t)}{\nu^k} + \frac{ut}{\nu} + \left(\frac{u+2gn}{\nu}\right) t \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{u_k(t)}{\nu^k} \right] \right\} \\ = \sum_{j=1}^\infty \frac{T_j(u,g,t)}{\nu^j} \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

whereby the T_j are defined and $t = 1/\sqrt{1+z^2}$. For the Olver polynomials, u_k and v_k, see *e.g.* [12].

Asymptotically one finds

$$\zeta(s) = A_{-1}(s) + A_0(s) + A_+(s) + \sum_{j=1}^\infty A_j(s), \tag{18}$$

where $A_{-1}(s)$ and $A_0(s)$ are the same as in Robin boundary conditions (see [11]). The new quantities are

$$A_+(s) = \frac{\sin \pi s}{\pi} \sum_{Lmn} \int_0^\infty dz\ (z\nu)^{-2s} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \log\left(1 + \frac{2gnt}{\nu}\right), \tag{19}$$

and

$$A_j(s) = \frac{\sin \pi s}{\pi} \sum_{Lmn} \int_0^\infty dz\ (z\nu)^{-2s} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \frac{T_j(u,g,t)}{\nu^j}. \tag{20}$$

In order to proceed it is convenient to express T_j as the finite sum

$$T_j = \sum_{a,b,c} f^{(j)}_{a,b,c} \frac{\delta^c t^a}{(1+\delta t)^b}, \tag{21}$$

with $\delta = 2gn/\nu$. The $f^{(j)}_{a,b,c}$ are easily determined via an algebraic computer programme.

The next steps are to perform the z-integrations by the identity,

$$\int_0^\infty dz\ z^{-2s} \frac{zt^x}{(1+\delta t)^y} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Gamma(1-s)}{\Gamma(y)} \sum_{k=0}^\infty (-1)^k \frac{\Gamma(y+k)\Gamma(s-1+(x+k)/2)}{k!\Gamma((x+k)/2)} \delta^k, \tag{22}$$

and then do the angular momentum summation,

$$\sum_{Lmn} = \sum_{L=0,1/2,1,\ldots}^\infty (2L+1) \sum_{n=-L}^{L} . \tag{23}$$

The sum over n may be treated in terms of Bernoulli numbers while that over L produces Hurwitz zeta functions. In this way, all terms contributing to a heat-kernel coefficient can be determined systematically.

In addition to the coefficients $a_0, a_{1/2}$, we find

$$a_1 = |S^3| \left(\frac{2}{1-g^2} S + 1 + \frac{2}{1-g^2} - \frac{1}{g} \log \frac{1+g}{1-g} \right) \tag{24}$$

where $|S^3|$ is the sphere volume. A comparison of this expression with the general one, (3), evaluated on the 4-ball in the notation of [3], *viz*

$$a_1 = \frac{1}{6} |S^3| \left(3b_0 + Sb_2 + g^2 \sigma_1 \right),$$

yields

$$b_2 = \frac{12}{1-g^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{2} b_0 + \frac{1}{6} g^2 \sigma_1 = 1 + \frac{2}{1-g^2} - \frac{1}{g} \log \frac{1+g}{1-g}.$$

Together with the two equations from the conformal properties [3],

$$b_0 - b_1 - \frac{1}{2}b_2 + 1 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad b_0 - 2b_1 - b_2 + 4 - \sigma_1\Gamma^2 = 0,$$

one has three equations for three unknowns, the solution of which gives the known answer, (4) [2].

Going beyond these results, we find the next two coefficients on the 4-ball,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{a_{3/2}}{8\sqrt{\pi}|S^3|} =& \frac{S}{8g^2}\left(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-g^2}}\right)\\ &+ \frac{1}{(1-g^2)^{3/2}}\left(\frac{3}{8} - \frac{1}{48g^4} - \frac{5}{32g^2} - \frac{11g^2}{96} + \frac{S}{4} + \frac{S^2}{8}\right)\\ &+ \frac{1}{1-g^2}\left(-\frac{107}{512} + \frac{1}{48g^4} + \frac{1}{6g^2} + \frac{11g^2}{512}\right)\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

and

$$\frac{a_2}{8|S^3|} = \frac{29 - 28g^2 - g^4 + 90S - 30g^2S + 90S^2 + 30S^3}{180(g^2-1)^2}. \tag{26}$$

It may be checked that the limit $g \to 0$ agrees with known results for Robin conditions.

Avramidi and Esposito [3] have given general forms for $a_{3/2}$ and a_2 constructed from the allowed geometric objects subject to the restriction that the boundary covariant derivative of Γ^i vanishes. Unfortunately this is not so in our case, but Avramidi and Esposito's expression for $a_{3/2}$ can be augmented to allow for a nonzero covariant derivative without too much effort. For length considerations, this, and the comparison with our result, will be carried out elsewhere.

As is apparent from (4), something odd happens whenever any eigenvalue of Γ^2 is greater than, or equal to, one. In fact our specific expressions (24) – (26) exhibit branch points and poles at $g^2 = 1$. These singularities can be attributed to a loss of ellipticity in the form of a breakdown of the Lopatinski condition, which, when satisfied, guarantees that the system has a unique solution. (See *e.g.* [6–9].)

In order to describe this condition, we note first that the leading symbol of the Laplacian on $\partial\mathcal{M}$, $= \mathrm{S}^3$, is $-g^{ij}\xi_i\xi_j = -\xi^a\xi_a = -\boldsymbol{\xi}.\boldsymbol{\xi}$ in terms of anholonomic coordinates. Similarly the leading symbol of the boundary condition (5) is $\partial_r + \boldsymbol{\Gamma}.\boldsymbol{\xi}$ and the classic Lopatinski condition requires that the set of equations

$$\big(-\partial_r^2 + \boldsymbol{\xi}^2\big)f(r) = 0; \quad f(r) \to 0 \quad r \to \infty \tag{27}$$

and

$$\big(-\partial_r - \boldsymbol{\Gamma}.\boldsymbol{\xi}\big)f(r)\big|_{\partial\mathcal{M}} = h(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \tag{28}$$

should have a unique solution for any $h(\boldsymbol{\xi})$, for $|\boldsymbol{\xi}| \neq 0$.

The relevant solution of the extended collar equation, (27), is

$$f(r) = w(\boldsymbol{\xi}) \exp\big(-|\boldsymbol{\xi}|r\big)$$

so that (28) reads

$$\big(|\boldsymbol{\xi}| - \boldsymbol{\Gamma}.\boldsymbol{\xi}\big)w(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = |\boldsymbol{\xi}|\big(1 - g\cos\theta\big)w(\boldsymbol{\xi}) = h(\boldsymbol{\xi})$$

and there is a clear breakdown of invertibility when $g \geq 1$ so that the system is then not well-posed. $w(\boldsymbol{\xi})$ is undetermined on a conical hypersurface in anholonomic coordinate space. (The argument extends to the case when the Γ^a are not constant and also to a general boundary.)

This situation is occasioned partly by the reality conditions imposed on the quantities occurring in the boundary condition (1). In contrast, for the *Euclidean* string interacting with an electromagnetic field, [13], these conditions produce no non-ellipticity, the beta-function, for example, being regular. However the operator seems not to be self-adjoint.

In conclusion we have derived the scalar heat-kernel coefficients up to a_2 on the four-ball for oblique boundary conditions of the simplest kind. An important extension would be that to arbitrary dimensions through higher spheres or tori, and this is under investigation.

A case of ‘practical’ interest is quantum gravity. Here however the vector bundle is that of symmetric tensors and the Γ^i are matrices composed from geometrical objects. These matrices are such that Γ^2 does not commute with Γ^i, considerably complicating the construction of the general forms [3]. The technique of special case evaluation could be of assistance in this problem. It remains to be proved that the system is elliptic although one expects that it should be.

In our opinion, the complicated character of the higher coefficients makes their explicit general forms uninviting and it seems more likely that their evaluation in particular cases will prove more valuable. However, the general form would be needed if one were interested in evaluating the effective action from conformal variation. In four dimensions, this seems prohibitively awkward. The two-dimensional case was done in [2].

Acknowledgments

We wish to thank Ivan Avramidi for assistance, in particular for an important clarification of the meaning of the eigenvalue condition.

This investigation has been partly supported by the DFG under contract number BO1112/4-1.

References

1. Barvinsky,A.O.*Phys. Lett.* **195B** (1987) 344.
2. McAvity,D.M. and Osborn,H. Asymptotic expansion of the heat kernel for generalised boundary conditions *Class. Quant. Grav.* **8** (1991) 1445.
3. Avramidi,I. and Esposito,G. Heat kernel asymptotics with generalised boundary conditions, hep-th/9701018.
4. Moss,I.G. and Silva P.J., Invariant boundary conditions for gauge theories gr-qc/9610023.
5. Branson,T.P. and Gilkey,P.B. *Comm. Partial Diff. Eqns.* **15** (1990) 245.
6. Egorov,Yu.V. and Shubin,M.A. Partial Differential Equations (Springer-Verlag, Berlin,1991).
7. Gilkey, P.B, Invariance theory, the heat equation and the Atiyah-Singer index theorem, 2nd. Edn., CRC Press, Boca Raton 1995.
8. Krantz,S.G. Partial Differential Equations and Complex Analysis (CRC Press, Boca Raton, 1992).
9. Treves,F. Introduction to Pseudodifferential and Fourier Integral Operators, Vol.1, (Plenum Press,New York,1980).
10. Bordag,M., B.Geyer, K.Kirsten and E.Elizalde, Zeta function determinant of the Laplace operator on the D-dimensional ball, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **179** (1996) 215.
11. Bordag,M., K.Kirsten,K. and Dowker,J.S.: Heat kernels and functional determinants on the generalized cone *Comm. Math. Phys.* **182** (1996) 371.
12. Abramowitz,M. and Stegun,I.A. Handbook of Mathematical Functions (Dover, New York, 1972).
13. Abouelsaood,A., Callan,C.G., Nappi,C.R. and Yost,S.A.*Nucl. Phys.* **B280** (1987) 599.